

Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi and Umeda, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “said field winding is wound onto said boss portion so as to have a larger diameter than a root inside diameter of said claw-shaped magnetic poles and is placed in contact with an inner peripheral surface of at least one of said linking structures with an insulating member interposed”, as required by independent claim 8. For example, as shown in Fig. 16 of the present application, the field winding 13 is placed in contact with an inner peripheral surface 39a of at least one of the linking structures 39 with an insulating member 27 interposed. By applying this feature, the claw-shaped magnetic poles are placed in contact with the field winding via the linking structure and the insulating member. Thus, overall rigidity of the claw-shaped magnetic poles is increased. As a result, vibration of the claw-shaped magnetic poles is suppressed, reducing electromagnetic noise.

The Examiner asserts Umeda “teaches a rotor with a field winding (8) ... is placed in contact with an inner peripheral surface of at least one of said claw-shaped poles with an insulating member (81) interposed (fig. 1, col. 2 lines 50+) ....” (emphasis added). The Examiner further asserts that “it would have been obvious to ... to modify the rotor [of Hayashi] by configuring the field winding ... [to be] placed in contact with an inner peripheral surface of at least one of said claw-shaped poles with an insulating member interposed, as taught by Umeda.” (emphasis added).

However, as discussed above, claim 8 does not recite that the field winding is placed in contact with an inner peripheral surface of at least one of the claw-shaped poles with an insulating member interposed, as the Examiner indicates in the rejection. Instead, claim 8

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Application No. 10/555,442

recites that the field winding is placed in contact with an inner peripheral surface of at least one of the linking structures with an insulating member interposed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8, as well as dependent claims 9, 10 and 14, should be allowable because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Christopher R. Lipp  
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 19, 2007

Attorney Docket No.: Q90893